

Shimkus	Stump	Visclosky
Shuster	Stupak	Walsh
Sisisky	Sununu	Wamp
Skaggs	Talent	Waters
Skeen	Tanner	Watkins
Skelton	Tauscher	Watt (NC)
Slaughter	Tauzin	Watts (OK)
Smith (MI)	Taylor (MS)	Waxman
Smith (NJ)	Taylor (NC)	Weldon (FL)
Smith (OR)	Thomas	Weldon (PA)
Smith (TX)	Thompson	Weller
Smith, Adam	Thornberry	Wexler
Snowbarger	Thune	Weygand
Snyder	Thurman	White
Solomon	Tiahrt	Whitfield
Souder	Tierney	Wicker
Spence	Torres	Wise
Spratt	Towns	Wolf
Stabenow	Trafigant	Woolsey
Stearns	Turner	Wynn
Stenholm	Upton	Yates
Stokes	Velazquez	Young (AK)
Strickland	Vento	Young (FL)

□ 1757

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. LATOURETTE]. On this rollcall, 421 Members have recorded their presence by electronic device, a quorum.

Under the rule, further proceedings under the call are dispensed with.

PROVIDING AMOUNTS FOR THE EXPENSES OF CERTAIN COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES IN THE ONE HUNDRED FIFTH CONGRESS

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] be able to reclaim the 1 minute that he yielded back, and I ask unanimous consent that I be able to yield to him 2 minutes of the 5¼ minutes that I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] has 3 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] has 3¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CONDIT].

□ 1800

Mr. CONDIT. Mr. Speaker, I stand today opposed to the rule.

Let me say that all of us in this body today are working frantically to try to do what we can to balance the budget of this country. Both my Republican colleagues and my Democratic colleagues are working very hard to do that. Yet today we stand here considering expending \$15 million to do an investigation in the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, \$15 million, when we are trying very hard to balance the budget of this country.

This is confusing to the American people. We are spending \$15 million, or requesting \$15 million, when in the Senate they are spending \$4 million. They are spending \$4 million to do a bigger and broader, more encompassing investigation than what we are consid-

ering here in the House. That does not make sense to the American people.

I came here in 1989. I do not think there has been 30 days since I have been here that we have not been investigating someone or something. I will tell my colleagues, the American people are sick and tired of that.

I think that we ought to have full disclosure. We ought to have investigations, but it makes no sense when the Senate or the other body has an investigation, asks questions, calls in witnesses, and then 2 weeks later we are doing the very same thing over here. That is a show. That is a show, and we are doing it over here to the tune of twice, three times as much money as the Senate is spending.

What we need to do is to change the process. We need to quit this. If we are going to have investigations, and we should, from time to time, we ought to clean the process up. We ought not to duplicate what the other body does. We ought not to spend money that we do not have to spend.

This is about the process. This is about doing what is right and what is fair. We did not even have a committee hearing about this issue. We did not discuss it a bit. That is not right. We can do better than that. That is not the way to do the House's business. We, at a minimum, should have discussed this in a committee hearing.

I want to tell my colleagues that out of the \$15 million we have \$8 million in a fund that we do not even know what is done with it. What are the American people going to say about that, when we are talking about reducing the costs of Medicare and Medicaid? This is wrong. This is not right and we ought to reject this rule today.

I say to my colleagues, if we want to do what we said we were going to do a couple of weeks ago, we ought to start today. We ought to start today by rejecting this rule.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to inform my colleagues that on July 16th of 1987 we established the Connecticut compromise, a bicameral legislature.

Someone who understands that is the very distinguished chairman of the Committee on House Oversight, my friend from Bakersfield, California [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS].

(Mr. THOMAS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I have to admit I am genuinely confused. It is indeed a rare occasion when I come to the floor and I find out that not only is my friend from Massachusetts saying good things about me in terms of the way I run a committee and the way we split funds, but I read the minority views from my friend from Connecticut, signed by all the members of the committee, about how fair I am and the fact that the distribution of the

funds was reasonable. And my colleagues really ought to read it, it is almost embarrassing how flattering they are about the way I run the committee, and then they immediately turn around and talk about this slush fund and they are worried about the slush fund and what is going to happen with it.

I am the same person who is chairman of the committee who is going to control the reserve fund. The reserve fund is just exactly that, reserve.

Now, these folks ought to know what a slush fund is. In the 103d Congress they had \$223 million to slush around. And what my colleagues need to know is that out of that \$223 million, more than half was spent outside public scrutiny. More than \$112 million was spent in the shadows, in closed door rooms.

What we did in the 104th Congress was put it all together, let sunshine in, and what you see is what you get. What we are asking for for this Congress is \$45 million less than they spent.

Now, how about a slush fund for \$45 million. Where was it? Soaked away in the committees. I just do not understand it, but we cannot have it both ways.

My friend from California, Mr. WAXMAN, he does understand it, his concern is that we said the funds are controlled by the majority. That is true, majority rules. That is called democracy.

He also said when we are in the majority we never went this far. That is a quote, and he is right. He is right. They never did go that far. He said, "We only have 25 percent of the resources." My friends, the 103d Congress, the minority, us at the time, had 14 percent of the resources in the Committee on Commerce. We had 15 percent of the resources in the Committee on House Oversight. We had 11 percent of the resources in the Committee on the Judiciary.

I tell my friend from California, he is right, they never went as far as we have.

My friend from Texas, Mr. DOGGETT, says we should not just point fingers, we ought to offer solutions. And then what he says is he wants more money to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight for the gentleman from California, Mr. WAXMAN, because Mr. WAXMAN has a letter from the Parliamentarian that says all they can do is investigate.

What is investigating? It is exposing. They cannot offer solutions. They cannot have it both ways. The committee that has the jurisdiction to pass the laws is the Committee on House Oversight. We have what we believe is appropriate. We will do the job.

Then I listened to a number of my friends in terms of how much money we are spending. My good friend from California, Mr. CONDIT, talks about how much money this is. In the 103d Congress they had \$223 million. We have passed welfare, we have passed reforming, we have ended patronage, and

we have audits with a whole lot less money.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the rule on House Resolution 91. In allocating a tremendous amount of money for an investigation of alleged fundraising abuses whose scope is restricted to the administration and the DNC, House Resolution 91 is overtly partisan and inequitable. It is amazing to me then, that the only amendment allowed under the rule, is the Thomas amendment. The rule allows the Thomas amendment, but denies important amendments which would have ensured that the investigation into alleged fundraising abuses, are conducted in as fair and non-partisan manner as possible. These amendments would have moved House Resolution 91 closer to the broader, more bipartisan Senate bill. Now this rule allows the spending of up to \$15 million wasteful dollars on a witch hunt.

The Thomas amendment is meaningless. Its purpose is to provide Members who are squeamish about voting for the very large funding increase provided by House Resolution 91, a cover. In so doing, it will facilitate passage of House Resolution 91. What proponents of the Thomas amendment would have us ignore, however, is the fact that this amendment is utterly unenforceable. It is simply a promise, a nonbinding promise. We have far more important actions that can be taken. This Congress can pass real campaign finance reform. I am for that but not a misguided attempt at partisan politics at its worst.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the rule, to oppose House Resolution 91, and to oppose the Thomas amendment. And real debate on campaign finance reform lets Republicans and Democrats work to clean our own house without this enormous expenditure for the Republican House Oversight Committee to play politics.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, a few years ago, as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Employment and Housing of the Government Operations Committee, I conducted an investigation of fraud, waste, abuse, and mismanagement of billions of Federal dollars at the Department of Housing and Urban Development during the Reagan administration. That investigation required almost 2 years to complete and involved the holding of some 30 public hearings.

That investigation was carried out with the regular subcommittee staff, which was augmented for a portion of that time by two investigators from the General Accounting Office. I received no additional funding for my investigation. We conducted a serious and thorough investigation with no allocation of additional funds.

Today, we are considering a Committee Funding Resolution that will provide some \$12 to \$15 million for the investigation Chairman BURTON proposes to conduct in the Government Reform and Oversight Committee. This resolution includes a slush fund of an additional \$8 million for this same investigation. The Government reform investigation is being allocated two to three times the amount which the Senate committee under Senator THOMPSON has received. Not only is Chairman BURTON's investigation duplicating only a portion of that same Senate investigation, he is doing so at three times the cost.

Mr. Speaker, the committee funding resolution is a serious waste of taxpayer dollars.

Many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have given us lengthy speeches about the necessity to reduce government waste and reduce the deficit. Here we have an opportunity to avoid waste, duplication, and encourage efficiency—but my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are simply voting to spend taxpayer moneys wastefully and unnecessarily.

The second concern that I would like to raise in connection with this legislation, Mr. Speaker, is the partisan nature of the Government Reform and Oversight Committee investigation that is being endorsed by supporting the committee funding resolution.

Mr. Speaker, an investigation that is bipartisan has credibility with the American people. An investigation that is partisan will be dismissed—as it should be—by the American people.

Again referring to the HUD investigation that I conducted earlier, our actions were totally bipartisan. Subpoenas were issued on the basis of the vote of the subcommittee—not by the unilateral action of the chairman—and every vote to issue a subpoena was unanimous. The direction and the details of that investigation were worked out with the active involvement and cooperation of my distinguished Republican colleague, CHRIS SHAYS of Connecticut. That investigation was taken seriously because it was bipartisan, that investigation had credibility with the American people because it was bipartisan.

This resolution today provides excessive funding for an investigation that is partisan and wasteful and outrageous. Mr. Speaker, a vote for this resolution will come back to haunt those of my colleagues who mistakenly vote for it.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 210, nays 213, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 67]

YEAS—210

Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brady
Bryant
Bunning

Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Castle
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Coble
Collins
Combest
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis (VA)

Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske

Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gilman
Gingrich
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Granger
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hobson
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kelly
Kim
King (NY)
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)

Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lucas
Manzullo
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Molinar
Moran (KS)
Morella
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Packard
Pappas
Parker
Paul
Paxon
Pease
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Riley
Rogan
Rogers

NAYS—213

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Berman
Berry
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Chabot
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coburn
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley

Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Goode
Gordon
Graham
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Hoyer
Inglis
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Klecza

Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryun
Saxton
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Schiff
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Snowbarger
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Upton
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

Pelosi	Scarborough	Taylor (MS)
Peterson (MN)	Schumer	Thompson
Pickett	Scott	Thurman
Pomeroy	Serrano	Tierney
Poshard	Sherman	Torres
Price (NC)	Sisisky	Towns
Rahall	Skaggs	Trafigant
Rangel	Skelton	Turner
Reyes	Slaughter	Velazquez
Rivers	Smith, Adam	Vento
Roemer	Snyder	Visclosky
Rothman	Souder	Waters
Roybal-Allard	Spratt	Watt (NC)
Rush	Stabenow	Waxman
Sabo	Stark	Wexler
Salmon	Stenholm	Weygand
Sanchez	Stokes	Wise
Sanders	Strickland	Woolsey
Sandlin	Stupak	Wynn
Sanford	Tanner	Yates
Sawyer	Tauscher	

NOT VOTING—10

Andrews	Kasich	Smith (TX)
Flake	Kennedy (MA)	Smith, Linda
Gillmor	Oxley	
Kaptur	Sensenbrenner	

□ 1822

So the resolution was not agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. ARMEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, as the body knows, the committee funding expires on March 31 during a period of time in which Congress is in recess. That being the case, it is necessary that we resolve this issue of committee funding before we leave.

Mr. Speaker, what I would like to suggest that the House do is every Member, of course, understanding that we are weighing the importance of completing this work against the natural, in many cases urgent, desire of Members to catch trains and airplanes, that we might ask that the House recess for 15 minutes during which time I can inquire to the minority as to the possibility of working out a unanimous-consent request that would allow us to complete our evening's work tonight, and if so, we would be able to come back in 15 minutes, make an announcement, and proceed, or if necessary we would have to make an announcement about a session tomorrow.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 2345

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MCINNIS) at 11 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 91, RESOLUTION PROVIDING AMOUNTS FOR THE EXPENSES OF CERTAIN COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES IN THE 105TH CONGRESS

Mr. DREIER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 105-41) on the resolution (H. Res. 105) providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 91) providing amounts for the expenses of certain committees of the House of Representatives in the One Hundred Fifth Congress, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Ms. WATERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. WATERS addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. FILNER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. FILNER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. HANSEN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. WAMP] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. WAMP addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. SMITH of Michigan addressed the House. His remarks will appear

hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. GINGRICH addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. CANNON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. CANNON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DREIER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WATERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DREIER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HANSEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WAMP, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GINGRICH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CANNON, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DREIER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. STARK.

Mr. EDWARDS.

Ms. NORTON.

Ms. FURSE.

Mr. ALLEN.

Mr. BLAGOJEVICH.

Mr. MCNULTY.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

Mr. TORRES.

Ms. KAPTUR.

Ms. HARMAN.

Mr. ACKERMAN.

Mr. KLECZKA.

Mr. BLUMENAUER.

Mr. BORSKI.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.

Mr. MENENDEZ.

Mr. LANTOS.

Mr. CLEMENT.

Mr. BARCIA.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida.

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri.